



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

appear, by Brakman, Hauck, and Kronenberg. Many of these are suggestive, especially that put forward by Kronenberg on the vexed passage *Ep.* 20. 2.

The second edition is wholesomely conservative, culling the best from the brilliant but unwarranted guesses of Lipsius, Fickert, and other scholars of distinction. In 92.35 the editor has improved in this respect on the 1898 volume, doing away with *esse* and thus arriving more nearly at the MS *secundis (dis) cinxisset*. In 33.2 he has expunged *durus*, his previous conjecture. In 40.9 he has had the courage to retain *qui itaque*, with which many editors have toyed.

He has made many improvements: for example, in 47.5, by the addition of Rossbach's *toro* after *torum*; in 58.10, *sed quaedam animam habent* for the more awkward *sed sunt quaedam quae*, thus matching the *sed quaedam* of four lines below; and in 97.13, *secura esse non possunt*, adding *esse* on good authority. In 74.14, his suspicion that *non incredibile* is correct leads him to insert it in the body of the text.

Misprints are rare. We note *tristitae* for *tristitiae*, 59.2; *parternae* for *paternae*, 57.9; and *nan* for *non*, 96.72. I doubt that *cogita* (for *cogito*) is a misprint, as W. Gemoll maintains in his review (*Woch. f. kl. Phil.*, June 29, 1914). We should like to see uniformity wherever possible in the spelling of *sed*, *audacter*, and a few other cases of a similar kind.

But these are minor details. It is unreasonable to expect, with the reviewer above named, that the *testimonia* beneath the text should be indefinitely multiplied. There are so many sources for Seneca's rapid-fire expressions, hastily ransacked from a facile memory, that it would be impossible to make them complete without publishing an edition with full commentaries. The book is welcome to those who value Seneca's prose and above all the *Letters*, which are the most representative specimens of that prose.

RICHARD M. GUMMERE

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax. Von W. A. BÄHRENS. (Sonderabdruck aus *Philologus*, Supplementband XII, zweites Heft.) Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1912. Pp. 320. M. 9.

Bährens' studies are a most important contribution to our knowledge of Latin syntax. They are in part a protest against the tendency of editors to "standardize" the syntax of the texts they are editing. At the same time they reveal another danger of the practice of many editors who seek to avoid the tiresome and expensive task of examining a large number of MSS by selecting, more or less at haphazard, a MS or a group of MSS to serve as

the basis of their text. A late or out-of-the-way MS may be the sole preserver of the tradition at many points. Erratic syntax has discredited many a MS, and yet this very fact may be its strongest claim to consideration. Only a systematic study of all the MSS in their relationship can determine whether a given MS has transmitted a genuine tradition or not. In this connection the importance of establishing the *Überlieferungsgeschichte* becomes obvious. Even when certain syntactical vagaries have been proven for the archetype, there still remains the question whether they may not be a reflection of the syntactical usage of the time and the locality of that archetype rather than of the actual usage of the author. For answering this question Bährens' work furnishes valuable material as well as valuable suggestions for further investigation along the same line, though some of his 1,200 examples may be regarded as questionable, and though many of the points are discussed in only a cursory manner.

It is difficult to give, in a short review, an adequate impression of the wide range of the author's investigations and the immense labor involved, especially as the arrangement is of necessity somewhat confused—a confusion which is increased by the fact that the author himself has been careless in indicating his scheme of subdivision; e.g., III is repeated from p. 321 (89) on p. 379 (147); the numeral on p. 402 (170) should be V instead of IIII; the remaining headings are not numbered in the text though the numbers are given in the table of contents; index letters to indicate subdivisions are also omitted here and there.

About half the space is devoted to ἀπὸ κοινοῦ and related constructions. Bährens points out that philology as well as philosophy has suffered from *Spekulativismus*; many readings have been rejected on strictly logical grounds, the psychological aspect being disregarded; sometimes the usage of the editor's own language influences his decision. Often a construction is rejected because the editor is unfamiliar with the *Sprachgebrauch* of any author but his own and he therefore condemns a usage because he finds no parallel for it. A long list of passages, beginning with Cato, is given where a preposition belonging to two words is expressed only with the second; the editors, however, almost invariably have inserted a preposition with the first member; similarly with conjunctions, adverbs, etc. Instances where the reverse process has taken place are illustrated.

In chap. ii ("Über verwandte Konstruktionen") Bährens discusses other cases where a preposition may be omitted and instances where the second part of such combinations as *tam . . . quam, magis . . . quam, ut . . . ita*, etc., is lacking. Chap. iii ("Andere Ellipsen") deals with the ellipsis of *ut* after a *ne*-clause, of demonstratives, of *posse*, etc.; especially interesting is the use of *quam=quam ut* after a comparative idea. Bährens gives an example each from Tacitus, Livy, and Velleius and two from Seneca and a number from late Latin writers. Additional passages are cited where *quam=quam quod, quam si, nisi=nisi si*, etc.

Chap. iv ("Einiges über Wortstellung im Lateinischen") deals with cases where *et*, *etiam*, *quoque*, *autem*, *sed*, etc., seem to be misplaced; chap. v ("Über einige Pleonasmen") with certain pleonastic uses of prepositions and conjunctions. Chap. vi illustrates the use of *illi* for *illic*, and chap. vii is a discussion of the construction *κατὰ σύνεσιν*. Chap. viii ("Über einige sogenannte Gräzismen") deals especially with constructions that occur in late Latin, e.g., *ut* with the infinitive in O.O., *priusquam*, *tamquam*, *propter quod* with the infinitive, the infinitive=imperative, and the "Greek dative."

The last chapter is very suggestive. Among the topics discussed or touched upon are: the use of the subjunctive in clauses containing a verb of necessity, possibility, will, and the like; the present and perfect subjunctive in *quotiens*-clauses, in clauses introduced by *magis quam*, *quantum*, *quando*, *sicut*, *ubi*, etc. Especially interesting are the examples where the indicative and the subjunctive are found side by side without any apparent difference in meaning. Bährens rightly remarks that the study of the extent of the use of this "variatio" would be an extremely profitable investigation. The book deserves a more elaborate *Sach- und Wortindex* than the author has provided. A second index gives a list of the passages discussed.

CHARLES H. BEESON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Der Staat der alten Italiker. Untersuchungen über die ursprüngliche Verfassung der Latiner, Osker, und Etrusker. Von A. ROSENBERG. Berlin, 1913. Pp. 142.

This book is an important and timely contribution to Roman constitutional history, and its arguments must be reckoned with even though they do not in every instance carry conviction. In the first chapter the author derives the Roman aedileship from Tusculum on the basis of *Eph. Epig.* ix. 680. His interpretation of the inscription is correct; however, this does not prove that the Tusculan institution was the source of the Roman. The position of the aedile of Furfo (*CIL.* i. 603) and of the Ostian *praetores et aediles sacris faciundis*, shows that village temple keepers (aediles) often acquired civil duties of importance in other Latian towns when those towns grew into large cities.¹ In other words, the civil aedileship was probably an early Latin institution found in many towns besides Tusculum.

The third chapter concludes from Oscan inscriptions that the early Italic censorship coincided with the regular duoviral magistracy of every *quinquennium*, i.e., that the *quinquennialitas* was the original censorial magistracy of Italy and that the separate censorship of Rome was therefore a new invention. His argument on this point seems to me convincing and of some importance. In chap. iv the author infers that the *quattuorvirate* of the

¹ This fact first recorded by Taylor (*Cults of Ostia*, 1912, p. 18) has now been reiterated by Kornemann (*Klio*, 1914, p. 194) in a review of Rosenberg.